

[USA Today 's editorial today](#) is questioning where the oft-promised fiscal restraint in Washington is:

When it comes to federal spending, there's a pattern emerging with President Obama, and it's not a flattering one. The president says all the right things about the importance of getting the deficit under control, but his actions don't come close to matching his rhetoric.

An early sign of the disconnect was his heavily publicized demand last month that his Cabinet secretaries shave \$100 million from their administrative budgets. Obama said the cuts would "send a signal that we are serious about how government operates" and would help close the "confidence gap" with skeptical Americans. Those cuts amounted to a less-than-confidence-inspiring 0.003% of the 2009 budget, or about 3 cents out of every \$1,000.

Then, when he unveiled his 2010 budget last week, Obama made a big deal of his demand for \$17 billion in cuts, insisting that the cuts "even by Washington standards ... are significant" and that \$17 billion is "real money."

The president got it backward. Out in the rest of the world, \$17 billion is a ton of money. But in Washington, where the president is proposing to spend \$3.6 trillion next year, \$17 billion looks puny - a little less than half a percent of the budget, or the equivalent of cutting a \$100 grocery bill by handing back a 50-cent pack of gum.

Congressman Pence has long advocated for fiscal sanity, [most recently with an op-ed on "Debt Day"](#) where he noted

As most Hoosiers know and common sense dictates, we as a nation cannot borrow and spend our way back to prosperity. The path to our economic recovery may begin with the sacrifice and tough choices currently being made in our small businesses, around the kitchen table or on the farm, but it must not end there; Washington must follow suit. Our federal government's budget should reflect the restraint and priorities of our families' budgets -- not run up a mountain of debt for our children and grandchildren.

